



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/567,929	11/09/2006	Michael Duerr	285450US8X PCT	5376
22850	7590	02/19/2010	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			HO, ANTHONY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2815	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/19/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on January 19, 2010 has been entered.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on January 19, 2010 was filed after the mailing date of the Final Office Action on September 17, 2009. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 8 and 9 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 8 recites, "wherein the band gap of said at least one hole conductor" in lines 1-2 of claim 8. For examination purposes, please replace said recitation with "wherein the band gap of said at least one organic hole conductor." Claim 9 recites, "wherein said hole conductor" in lines 1-2 of claim 9. For examination purposes, please replace said

Art Unit: 2815

recitation with "wherein said at least one organic hole conductor." Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 4 recites, "wherein said carbon nanotubes are a mixture of metallic and semiconducting carbon nanotubes." However, it is unclear from claim 1, in which claim 4 depends upon, that the carbon nanotubes are in mixture form. Claim 5 recites, "wherein said carbon nanotubes are a mixture of multi-walled and single-walled carbon nanotubes." However, it is unclear from claim 1, in which claim 4 depends upon, that the carbon nanotubes are in mixture form. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to define the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 2815

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-10, 13, 16-18, and 21-24, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kymakis et al, "Single-Wall Carbon Nanotube/Conjugated Polymer Photovoltaic Devices," Applied Physics Letters, American Institute of Physics. New York, US, vol. 80, no. 1, 7 January 2002 (2002-01-07), pages 112-114 with support of Dukovic et al, "Structural Dependence of Excitonic Optical Transitions and Band-Gap Energies in Carbon Nanotubes," Nano Letters, Vol. 5, No. 11 (pp. 2314-2318) 2005 (teaching reference).

In re claims 1 and 13, Kymakis et al discloses a photovoltaic device, comprising a composition of carbon nanotubes and of at least one organic compound (Figure 1; page 112, column 1, lines 24-26).

Dukovic et al teaches the band gap of SWNTs are dependent upon the diameter of the carbon nanotubes and are defined by equation (4) – band gap = $(0.34 \text{ eV}/d_t) + (1.11 \text{ eV}/(d_t + 0.11))$ (i.e. page 2317, first column).

Kymakis et al discloses using SWNTs, in which their diameter is 1.4 nm (i.e. page 112, second column). Substituting 1.4 nm for d_t in equation (4) above, the band gap obtained is 0.978 eV.

Art Unit: 2815

Thus, Kymakis et al has a composition of carbon nanotubes (in this case, SWNTs), wherein the band gap of said carbon nanotubes lies in the range of from about 0.5 to about 1 eV (in this case, the band gap is 0.978 eV).

In re claim 2, Kymakis et al discloses the first and second electrodes are made of ITO and aluminum (page 113, column 2, line 9).

In re claim 3, Kymakis et al discloses the material used in the device is P3OT.

In re claim 4, Kymakis et al discloses the carbon nanotubes are a mixture of metallic and semiconducting carbon nanotubes (page 112, column 1, line 36 – column 3, line 2).

In re claim 6, Kymakis et al discloses the carbon nanotubes have a diameter of 1.4 nm (page 112, column 2, line 9).

In re claim 8, Kymakis et al discloses the band gap of at least one of the hole conductor lies in the range of from about 1 eV to 3 eV (page 113, column 1, lines 23-26).

In re claim 9, Kymakis et al discloses the LUMO of P3OT is 2.85 eV (page 114, column 1, lines 29-30), its bandgap 2.4 eV (page 113, column 1, line 24), addition of

Art Unit: 2815

these values results in a HOMO of 5.25 eV which is greater than the HOMO of the carbon nanotubes (page 114, column 1, lines 16-17).

In re claim 10, Kymakis et al discloses the composition comprises a mixture of carbon nanotubes and at least one hole conductor (page 112, column 2, lines 5-17).

In re claim 16, Kymakis et al discloses the hole conductor is one of the listed materials, P3OT.

In re claim 17, the recitation "wherein it is an organic solar cell" in the claim preamble specifies an intended use or field of use and is treated as nonlimiting since it has been held that in device claims, intended use must result in a structural difference between the claim invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claim invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). A claim containing a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987).

Art Unit: 2815

In re claim 18, Kymakis et al discloses the one of the electrodes is a film or layer of a transparent material, ITO.

In re claim 21, Kymakis et al discloses a glass substrate (i.e. Figure 1).

In re claim 22, it is well known in the art that a flexible polymer substrate is used in photovoltaic devices.

In re claim 23, the recitation “a combination of the device according to claim 1 with a circuit, wherein the device acts as an internal power supply” in the claim preamble specifies an intended use or field of use and is treated as nonlimiting since it has been held that in device claims, intended use must result in a structural difference between the claim invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claim invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). A claim containing a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987).

Art Unit: 2815

In re claim 24, the recitation “a solar cell” in the claim preamble specifies an intended use or field of use and is treated as nonlimiting since it has been held that in device claims, intended use must result in a structural difference between the claim invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claim invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). A claim containing a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. Claim 5, as best understood, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kymakis et al, “Single-Wall Carbon Nanotube/Conjugated Polymer Photovoltaic Devices,” Applied Physics Letters, American Institute of Physics. New York, US, vol. 80, no. 1, 7 January 2002 (2002-01-07), pages 112-114 with support of Dukovic et al, “Structural Dependence of Excitonic Optical Transitions and Band-Gap Energies in Carbon Nanotubes,” Nano Letters, Vol. 5, No. 11 (pp. 2314-2318) 2005 (teaching reference) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Tsukamoto et al (JP 2003-096313).

Art Unit: 2815

Tsukamoto et al discloses the carbon nanotubes are a mixture of multi-walled and single-walled carbon nanotubes (paragraph 0008).

The advantage is to increase the mobility of the semiconductor device (i.e. paragraph 0005).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the photovoltaic device as taught by Kymakis et al with the carbon nanotubes are a mixture of multi-walled and single-walled carbon nanotubes as taught by Tsukamoto et al in order to increase the mobility of the semiconductor device.

10. Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kymakis et al, "Single-Wall Carbon Nanotube/Conjugated Polymer Photovoltaic Devices," Applied Physics Letters, American Institute of Physics. New York, US, vol. 80, no. 1, 7 January 2002 (2002-01-07), pages 112-114 with support of Dukovic et al, "Structural Dependence of Excitonic Optical Transitions and Band-Gap Energies in Carbon Nanotubes," Nano Letters, Vol. 5, No. 11 (pp. 2314-2318) 2005 (teaching reference) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Forrest et al (US Patent 6,451,415).

Forrest et al discloses a multilayer structure for photovoltaic devices (Figure 2D). The advantage is for efficient charge carrier generation (column 8, lines 51-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the photovoltaic device as taught by Kymakis et al

Art Unit: 2815

with a multilayer structure for photovoltaic devices as taught by Forrest et al in order for efficient charge carrier generation.

11. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kymakis et al, "Single-Wall Carbon Nanotube/Conjugated Polymer Photovoltaic Devices," Applied Physics Letters, American Institute of Physics. New York, US, vol. 80, no. 1, 7 January 2002 (2002-01-07), pages 112-114 with support of Dukovic et al, "Structural Dependence of Excitonic Optical Transitions and Band-Gap Energies in Carbon Nanotubes," Nano Letters, Vol. 5, No. 11 (pp. 2314-2318) 2005 (teaching reference) as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Ganzorig et al, "Alkali metal acetates as effective electron injection layers for organic electroluminescent device," Materials Science and Engineering B, Elsevier Sequoia, Lausanne, Ch, vol. 85, no. 2-3, 22 August 2001 (2001-08-22), pages 140-143.

Ganzorig et al discloses the addition of an LiF, CsF or Li-acetate interlayer between the Al electrode and the organic hole conducting compound layer (Abstract). The advantage is to lower the work function of the Al layer and thus enhance hole transfer from the organic compound to the Al electrode (Abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the photovoltaic device as taught by Kymakis et al with the addition of an LiF, CsF or Li-acetate interlayer between the Al electrode and the organic hole conducting compound layer as taught by Ganzorig et al in order to lower

Art Unit: 2815

the work function of the Al layer and thus enhance hole transfer from the organic compound to the Al electrode.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6, 8-13, 16-18, and 20-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANTHONY HO whose telephone number is (571)270-1432. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 9:30AM-5:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kenneth Parker can be reached on 571-272-2298. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2815

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/A. H./

Examiner, Art Unit 2815

/Kenneth A Parker/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2815